



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,208	10/27/2005	Mezher Hussein Ali	AC-21-US	3691
50446 7590 07/29/2008 HOXIE & ASSOCIATES LLC 75 MAIN STREET, SUITE 301 MILLBURN, NJ 07041				
EXAMINER				
CHANG, CELIA C				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/29/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/522,208

Applicant(s)

ALI ET AL.

Examiner

Celia Chang

Art Unit

1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-41 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/86)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/22/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application is a 371 of PCT/GB2003/003099.
A preliminary amendment was filed on Jan. 13, 2005. Claim 12 has been canceled.
Claim 1-11, 13-30 are pending.

2. *Election/Restrictions*

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claims 3-6, 11, drawn to compounds wherein R is C₁₋₃alkylAr¹, Ar¹ is substituted phenyl. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed species is also required. Claims 1-2, 7-10, 13-14 reading on the elected compounds can be prosecuted together with the election to the extend of the election.

Group II, claims 1-2, 7-10, 13-14, drawn to compounds wherein R is C₁₋₃alkylAr¹, Ar¹ is substituted pyridyl. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed species is also required.

Group III, claim 15, drawn to method of inhibiting glucosylceramide synthase in a patient. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed compound for inhibiting the enzyme is also required.

Group IV, claim 16-17, drawn to method of treating glycolipid storage disease. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed compound for treating a single disclosed disorder is also required.

Group V, claim 18, drawn to method of treating Niemann-Pick disease type C, mucopolysaccharidosis type I, mucopolysaccharidosis type IIIA, mucopolysaccharidosis type IIIB, mucopolysaccharidosis type VI, mucopolysaccharidosis type VII, o--mannosidosis or--and mucolipidosis type IV in a patient. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed compound for treating a single disclosed disorder is also required.

Group VI, claims 19-20, drawn to method of treating cancer. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed compound for treating a single disclosed specific cancer is also required.

Art Unit: 1625

Group VII, claims 21, drawn to method of treating, Alzheimer's disease, epilepsy, stroke, Parkinson's disease or spinal injury in a patient. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed compound for treating a single disclosed disorder is also required.

Group VII, claim 22, drawn to method of treating microorganism infection. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed compound for treating a single disclosed species of microorganism infection is also required.

Group VIII, claim 23, drawn to method of treating disease associated with abnormal glycolipid synthesis in a patient. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed compound for treating a single disclosed disorder is also required.

Group IX, claims 24-25, drawn to method of treating a condition treatable by administering ganglioside. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed compound for treating a single disclosed disorder is also required.

Group X, claim 26, drawn to method of reversing male infertility in a mammal. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed compound for the method is also required.

Group XI, claim 27, drawn to method of treating obesity in a patient. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed compound for treating obesity is also required.

Group XII, claim 28-29, drawn to method of treating inflammatory diseases. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed compound for treating a single disclosed inflammatory disorder is also required.

Group XIII, claim 30, drawn to compounds of formula III. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed species is also required.

The inventions are independent or distinct, each from the other because inventions listed as Groups I-XIII do not relate to a single general inventive concept under 35 USC 121 or PCT Rule 13.1 because:

PCT Rule 13.1 states that the international application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept ("requirement of unity of invention").

PCT Rule 13.2 states that the unity of invention referred to in Rule 13.1 shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features.

Annex B, **Part 1(a)**, indicates that the application should relate to only one invention, of if there is more than one invention, inclusion is permitted if they are so linked to form a single general inventive concept.

Annex B **Part 1(b)**, indicates that “special technical features” means those technical features that as a whole define a contribution over the prior art.

Annex B **Part 1(c)**, further defines independent and dependent claims. Unity of invention only is concerned in relation to independent claims. Dependent claims are defined as a claim that contains all the features of another claim and is in the same category as the other claim. The category of a claim refers to the classification of claims according to subject matter e.g. product, process, use, apparatus, means, etc.

Annex B **Part 1(e)**, indicates that the permissible combinations of different categories of claims. **Part 1(e)I**, states that inclusion of an independent claim for a given product, an independent claim for a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an independent claim for a use of the said product is permissible.

Annex B, **Part 1(f)**, indicates the “Markush practice” of alternatives in a single claim. **Part 1(f)I**, indicates the technical relationship and the same or corresponding special technical feature is considered to be met when (A) all alternatives have a common property or activity, and (B) a common structure is present or all alternatives belong to a recognized class of chemical compounds. Further defining (B), Annex B, **Part 1(f)(i-iii)**, the common structure must; a) occupy a large portion of their structure, or b) the common structure constitutes a structurally distinctive portion, or c) where the structures are equivalent and therefore a recognized class of chemical compounds, each member could be substituted for one another with the same intended result. That is, with a common or equivalent structure, there is an expectation relationship and the corresponding special technical feature result from a common (or equivalent) structure that is responsible for the common activity (or property). **Part 1(f)iv**, indicates that when all alternatives of a Markush grouping can be differently classified, it shall not, taken alone, be considered justification for finding a lack of unity. **Part 1(f)v**, indicates that “When dealing with alternatives, if it can be shown that at least *one* Markush alternative is not novel over the prior art, the question of unity of invention shall be reconsidered by the examiner”.

In the instant case, at least one Markush alternative is not novel because prior art by Jung et al. US 4,639,436 anticipated group I, see col. 24, line 40 or col. 48, line 45, thus the lacking of unity of invention has been found.

Inventions I-II and III-XII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the method can be practiced with materially different products such as treating Alzheimer's disease with tacrine.

Inventions XIII and I-II are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product, and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.05(j)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as

agents for treating multidrug resistance, see claim 1, US 6,225,325 and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention. In the instant case, there could have been no patentability of all the claims since at least one Markush alternative is not novel because prior art by Jung et al. US 4,639,436 anticipated group I, see col. 24, line 40 or col. 48, line 45.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is *presented prior to* final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be **allowable**, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai; In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996).

Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include all the limitations of the product claims. *Applicants are reminded of propriety of process of use claims in consideration*

*of the "reach-through" format, which is drawn to mechanistic, receptor binding or enzymatic functionality. Reach through claims are considered lacking of descriptive and enabling support from the specification. Thus, rejoinable process of use claims are those with particular disease named with efficacy support from the specification for treating the particular disease. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.***

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01. Filing of appropriate terminal disclaimer in anticipation of a rejoinder may speed prosecution and the process of rejoinder.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Celia Chang, Ph. D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0679. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet L. Andres, Ph. D., can be reached on 571-272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

OACS/Chang
Jul. 23, 2008

/Celia Chang/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1625